Responses to Comment Set 37

37-1 This Final EIR includes text revisions in the Executive Summary (see Section 4, which includes the revised Executive Summary) and revisions to Chapter A of the Draft EIR (see Section 4, changes to page A-1) to note the correct legal name.

37-2 This Final EIR includes a text revision in the Executive Summary Table ES-1 and Table ES-3 (see Section 4, which includes the revised Executive Summary) to match the correct classification for Impact A-2: Particulate Emissions (Class II), as shown in the Draft EIR Section D.3, Air Quality (Draft EIR page D.3-11 through D.3-13). The final column of Table ES-3 has also been revised.

37-3 This Final EIR includes a text revision in Table B-1 of the Project Description (see Section 4, changes to page B-4) to note the maximum design pressure.

37-4 This Final EIR includes a text revision in Table B-1 of the Project Description (see Section 4, changes to Station Modifications on page B-4) to note the new shipping pumps.

37-5 This Final EIR includes text revisions in Section B (see Section 4, under changes to Section B.3.1 page B-3 and Section B.3.2 page B-18) to recognize the lease conditions anticipated by SFPP. The plans for the 20-inch pipeline (page B-18) have been updated to clarify the life expectancy of the existing segment of pipeline under the Carquinez Strait according to CSLC staff. Revisions were also made to note that a new directional drill under the Carquinez Strait would be approximately 6,800 feet (see Section 4, under changes to Section B.3.1.2 on page B-9 and changes to Section C.3.2.2 on page C-14).

37-6 This Final EIR includes a text revision in Section B.3.3.1 of the Project Description (Section 4, under changes to Section B.3.3.1 on page B-21) to note the new shipping pumps.

37-7 This Final EIR includes text revision in Section B.4.1 (Section 4, under changes to Section B.4.1 on page B-23) and Section D.9, Land Use (Section 4, under changes to Section D.9.3.3 on page D.9-17), to note the correct work rate.

37-8 Comments noted. As noted in Section C.1 of the Draft EIR, the CSLC is obligated by CEQA to consider a range of alternatives. Section 15126(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides in part "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. . . . The lead agency is responsible for selection of a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives." The Existing Pipeline ROW Alternative is retained for analysis in the Draft and Final EIR because it could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives; and would avoid or substantially lessen some of the impacts of the Proposed Project. An alternative cannot be eliminated because of economic concerns. The Draft EIR does address the issue of crowded utility corridors under the discussion for Impact US-1, and it finds that the Existing Pipeline ROW Alternative, which would avoid much construction in urban areas, would have a less likelihood accidentally damaging existing utility lines. This Final EIR does not identify an environmentally superior alternative because the "No Project Alternative" is not the environmentally superior alternative (see Section 15126(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines).

37-9 Comments noted. This Final EIR includes text revisions in Section C.3.3.2 to note the possible location of necessary pump stations under the No Project Alternative and the effect of drag reducing agents (DRA) under the No Project Alternative (see Section 4, under changes to Section C.3.3.2 on page C-17).

37-10 The analysis included in Section D.2 of the Draft EIR is somewhat conservative. However, as noted in Section D.2.1.1 (Draft EIR page D.2-1 to D.2-3), the analysis is intended to predict the performance of the proposed system over its 50-year life. It will be several decades before data is available to quantifiably document the impact of the new pipeline regulations on pipeline safety. Qualitatively, these regulations are likely to improve pipeline safety, decreasing the frequency of unintentional releases. But data is not yet available to verify these impacts. We concur that the differences between numbers within the comment and the Draft EIR analysis will not change the ultimate conclusions related to the analysis.

37-11 The text of Mitigation Measure S-1a (Minimize Effect on Other Underground Facilities) under Impact S-1.2 (Severance of Third Party Substructures during Construction) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-1.2 on page D.2-27).

37-12 The text of Mitigation Measure S-1b (Minimize Risk of Fire) under Impact S-1.3 (Injury, Death or Property Damage from Construction Fire) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-1.3 on page D.2-28).

37-13 The text of Mitigation Measure S-2a (Supplemental Spill Response Plan) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-2 on page D.2-35). The CSLC staff believes that it would inappropriate to remove the requirement to locate spill response equipment in the vicinity of the Sacramento Delta, however the text of this mitigation measure has been revised to allow further investigation of this requirement in the Supplemental Spill Response Plan.

37-14 The text of Mitigation Measure S-2b (Leak Detection) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-2 on page D.2-36). However, with these changes, the impact remains significant (Class I) as stated in the Draft EIR.

37-15 The text of Mitigation Measure S-2d (Prevent Third-Party Damage) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-2 on page D.2-36) to include the California State Fire Marshal in the required review process.

37-16 The text of Mitigation Measure S-2e (Conduct Pipeline Inspections) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-2 on page D.2-38) to set the timing of the initial internal pipeline inspection, which determines the interval between all subsequent inspections.

37-17 Even with regulatory requirements, external corrosion remains a leading cause of unintentional releases. Further, external corrosion can progress very rapidly. As a result, new pipelines are not immune from failures caused by external corrosion. Mitigation Measure S-2f (Ensure Proper Cathodic Protection) augments current pipeline regulations to further reduce the risk of these incidents.

For new pipeline systems, two situations must generally occur for an external corrosion caused unintentional release to result – coating defect and inadequate cathodic protection. Mitigation

Measure S-2f of this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-2.1, page D.2-38) includes revisions to allow the use of a close interval survey or DCVG Coating Anomaly (Pipe Camp) Survey. (A pipe camp survey would identify localized areas of coating damage that could lead to future unintentional releases.) These surveys are relatively inexpensive and are commonly performed on new pipelines, especially those in sensitive areas, immediately after construction to insure coating integrity and adequate levels of cathodic protection. These surveys reduce the likelihood of external corrosion caused releases.

37-18 The text of Mitigation Measure S-2g (Pipeline Markers) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to S-2.3, page D.2-40) to clarify the placement of marking tape.

37-19 The text of Mitigation Measure S-3a (Pipeline Abandonment Procedures) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Impact S-3, page D.2-52). The CSLC believes its approval, in conjunction with CSFM approval, would be appropriate for addressing impacts during abandonment of a pipeline subject to a CSLC lease.

37-20 The text of Mitigation Measure A-1a (Control Equipment Emissions) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact A-1, page D.3-10).

37-21 The text of Mitigation Measure A-2a (Control Dust and Particulate Emissions) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact A-2, page D.3-12). The requirement to stabilize dust at large inactive construction areas is retained because it is a recommendation from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District guidelines.

37-22 The text of Mitigation Measure A-3a (Transportation Management) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact A-3, page D.3-13).

37-23 The Mitigation Monitoring Program and CSLC policies and guidelines define the roles of monitors in the implementation of mitigation measures specified throughout the Draft EIR. SFPP and its contractor(s) are governed by such measures and the monitors' enforcement of these measures.

37-24 This statement about metabolizing hydrocarbons (Draft EIR, Section D.4.3.4, page D.4-63) is based on the knowledge and expertise of the EIR team fisheries expert, Dr. Noel Davis and is not based on a specific reference. Because hydrocarbon pollutants would move through the food chain along with naturally occurring substances, it is reasonable to assume that any consumer of the pollutant will need excess energy to process the pollutant.

37-25 See Response to Comment 37-23 regarding the role and responsibilities of monitors. All other changes to the text of Mitigation Measure BB-2a (Rare Plant Avoidance or Potential Impact, Section D.4.3.3, Draft EIR page D.4-38 under Impact BB-2) have been made in this Final EIR (see Section 4, changes to page D.4-38).

The requirement for additional pre-construction rare plant surveys in Segments 4 and 5 has been deleted based on review of the information in the comment and the Biological Assessment. However, additional pre-construction surveys for fragrant fritillary in Segment 1 must still be completed, as adequate documentation of appropriate surveys in that area was not provided in the Biological Assessment. These changes are documented in Section 4 under changes to Section D.4, pages D.4-71, -79, and -80.

37-26 The first suggested change to Mitigation Measure BB-3a (Tree Avoidance and Replacement, Section D.4.3.3, Draft EIR page D.4-39 under Impact BB-3), clarifying that the measure applies only to "protected" trees, has been made (see Section 4 under changes to Section D.4, page D.4-39).

The second suggested change to Mitigation Measure BB-3a has not been made. As part of the revegetation procedures in areas for replacing native oak and riparian woodlands, an appropriate native grass and wildflower seed mix must be included for any disturbed areas where trees would be planted.

37-27 See Response to Comment 37-23 regarding the role and responsibilities of monitors. While the wetlands and soils associated with seasonal wetlands do display the described characteristics, protective mats are necessary in areas of pooled or ponded water to minimize soil compaction. The text of Mitigation Measure BB-5a (Wetland Avoidance and Restoration, Section D.4.3.3, Draft EIR page D.4-43 under Impact BB-5) has been revised to specify the use of mats in areas of "pooled or ponded water."

Finally, salvaging of topsoil is necessary whether or not sensitive species are present. The organic matter and properties of topsoil are a necessary component to ensure the regeneration of vegetation to the ROW after construction disturbance. Therefore, salvaging of topsoil in wetland areas is still a requirement of Mitigation Measure BB-5a. However, Mitigation Measure BB-5a has been revised in this Final EIR to specify 6 inches of topsoil, as opposed to 12 inches, based on changes in other measures. All other suggested comments have been noted and the text of Mitigation Measure BB-5a has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure BB-5a on page D.4-43).

37-28 The addition of the phrase "as practical" is redundant as mitigation measures are required to be feasible, i.e., practical. The text of Mitigation Measure BB-5b (Trench Backfill and Topographic Restoration) has been modified in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure BB-5b on page D.4-44) to clarify the roles of responsible agencies.

37-29 The text of Mitigation Measure BB-5c (Riparian Avoidance and Restoration) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure BB-5c, page D.4-45) to specify 10 "working" days in the ninth bullet. As discussed in 37-28 above, "as practical" has not been added.

37-30 The text of Mitigation Measure BB-6a (Weed Management) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure BB-6a, page D.4-47). The text in the fourth bullet of Mitigation Measure BB-6a has been revised to incorporate the concerns of the commenter, but the exact wording has been changed in this Final EIR.

37-31 Mitigation Measure BW-1e (Minimize Disturbance at Water Crossings) has been revised to clarify that crossings of waterways and wetland areas may occur by trenching provided that this crossing method has been approved by the relevant permitting authority (CDFG or USACE). With that clarification, the recommended change to the third paragraph of this measure is not required.

Regarding the fourth paragraph, a qualified biological monitor is important to monitor for evidence of an unanticipated release of drilling fluids as well as evidence of sediment transport at all waterways; however, the comment is noted and the text of Mitigation Measure BW-1e has

been revised in this Final EIR to read that the biological monitor "shall visit the site periodically (generally on a daily basis) while boring or HDD operations are active . . . ," as opposed to "once daily" as originally written in the Draft EIR (see Section 4, changes to page D.4-50).

37-32 The text of Mitigation Measure BW-2a (Reduce Direct Mortality to Wildlife, Section D.4.3.3, Draft EIR page D.4-52 under Impact BW-2) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure BW-2a on page D.4-52) to provide this clarification.

37-33 See Response to Comment 37-23 regarding the role and responsibilities of monitors. As discussed in Response to Comment 37-31 above, the role of monitoring by a qualified biologist is crucial in ensuring the implementation of mitigation and the protection of biological resources. The CSLC monitor will also have the responsibility to ensure that the project is conducted consistent with approved plans, required mitigation, and other permit requirements.

37-34 The text of Mitigation Measure BW-3a (Protect Special Status Wildlife) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure BW-3a on page D.4-53) in response to this comment and comments from the California Department of Fish & Game (see Comment 35-6). CDFG recommends against the use of hand-operated mechanical trimming devices in salt marsh harvest mouse habitat. Pre-construction presence-absence surveys are no longer required; however, as not to weaken the intent of the measures, a Vegetation-clearing Plan approved by the CDFG is required and detailed in the text of Mitigation Measure BW-3a in this Final EIR. Details concerning the Vegetation-clearing Plan were developed from a meeting on August 11, 2003, between CSLC, FWS, NMFS, CDFG, URS, and Kinder Morgan, as referenced under Consultation History of the Draft Biological Opinion (dated September 15, 2003).

37-35 We concur, and the fifth bullet of Mitigation Measure B-3a (Pipeline Operations and Maintenance, Section D.4.3.5, Draft EIR page D.4-68 under Impact B-3) has been deleted. However, overland travel of vehicles during inspection in wet soil conditions has the potential to cause significant impacts through hydrologic alteration to wetlands by compacting the soil or creating ponded areas, and/or erosion/sedimentation; therefore, the wording in the sixth bullet has not been changed in this Final EIR.

37-36 The text introducing Table ES-2 of this Final EIR, in Section 5.2.1, Proposed Project vs. The Cordelia Mitigation Segment, has been revised to correctly show that although impacts to biological resources would be reduced with implementation of Mitigation Measure B-4a (Cordelia Mitigation Segment, Section D.4.3.6, Draft EIR page D.4-77 under Impact B-4) they would not be significantly reduced and impacts to historic resources, traffic, and land use would be greater. Mitigation measures to reduce the impacts in these issue areas are discussed in the Draft EIR (pages D.5-17, D.12-17, and D.9-6, respectively) with revisions in this Final EIR (see Section 4). Please also refer to Response to Comment 27-1.

37-37 The discussion in the Draft EIR for Impacts EC-1 and EC-2 sets forth mitigation measures that require visual inspection and possibly sampling and testing prior to trenching near known or suspected contaminated sites that could potentially impact the pipeline alignment. The CSLC staff believes that information gained from these activities will allow realistic preparation for work in contaminated soil, including manpower, equipment, notification of agencies, and waste transport. This work is in addition to implementation of contingency plans and health and safety

plans. Approval from DTSC, RWQCB, or County Health Departments is only required for active case files and where unknown contamination is encountered during trenching. Unknown contamination includes shallow groundwater contaminated from a nearby LUST that may have a case-closed status. Comments received on the Draft EIR from DTSC and RWQCB indicate both agencies are sensitive to hazardous waste issues and sampling for this project.

37-38 As described in Mitigation Measure EC-1a (Medium Potential Impact Sites, Draft EIR, page D.6-8), agency record file review and visual inspection of unpaved areas would be required for medium potential sites to obtain current information. Sites may achieve case-closed status during the time since the original database research was completed and the start of construction (1 to 2 years delay). Many medium potential sites may be eliminated by agency file review. However, it is unclear from the project database information if the groundwater was fully remediated at LUST sites with groundwater affected and case-closed classification. In these situations, contaminated shallow groundwater may be present at the project alignment. Review of agency files would provide additional information prior to construction on groundwater depth and quality. Preparation and implementation of hazardous material contingency plans and health and safety plans for the project are standard-of-care, but do not provide adequate advance coordination with agencies prior to construction and current information for each medium potential site.

37-39 As described in Mitigation Measure EC-1b (High Potential Impact Sites, Draft EIR, page D.6-9), high potential sites require an agency file review. Subsurface investigation is only required if the record review does not eliminate the possibility that contamination extends off-site and to the project alignment. Evaluating the specific contamination, concentration and extent at the time the project trench reaches the contaminated area does not provide the best protection for workers and the public. There is no distinct advantage to include the landfill sites with the high potential sites and, as such, may result in the landfills being overlooked.

37-40 This Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure EC-1c, page D.6-9) includes revisions to Mitigation Measure EC-1c (Unknown Soil or Groundwater Contamination) to require that the results of an investigation of contaminants encountered at an unknown site shall be approved by DTSC or the County Environmental Health Division within 60 days of completing this section of pipeline construction. Because the observance of contamination during construction would require work to stop and begin the agency review process, the investigation of contaminants would need to be reviewed and approved while construction in the area is temporarily suspended.

37-41 Mitigation Measure EC-2a (Landfill Gases, Draft EIR, page D.6-10) clearly distinguishes the presence of landfills near the project and no revision is necessary.

37-42 Mitigation Measure EC-3a (Abandoned Natural Gas Wells, Draft EIR, page D.6-11) does not require SFPP to abandon or confirm proper abandonment of oil or gas wells. With this measure, SFPP would be required to coordinate the discovery of unknown wells with Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources and may elect to avoid these wells.

37-43 This Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact G-2 on page D.7-9) includes revisions to Mitigation Measure G-2a (Paleontological Resource Procedures, Draft EIR, page D.7-18) to clarify that no paleontologic monitoring is required between MP 1.0 and 5.0. Between MP 11.0 and 15.5, some interbedded sediments occur within the

Sonoma Volcanics (refer to USGS Miscellaneous Field Investigations Map – MF-2403 available online from the USGS). The parts of the alignment that clearly go through igneous materials should not be monitored, however, trenching or boring through Tertiary sediments should definitely be monitored as these sediments are of the age that may contain significant fossils even though they occur within the unit identified as Sonoma Volcanics. The paleontologist assigned to implement Mitigation Measure G-2a may make the final determination as whether to monitor or not.

37-44 The Draft EIR includes Mitigation Measure G-3a (Geotechnical Investigations at Landslide Crossings), which would require measures to avoid the known slide areas or place the pipeline beneath the potential slide activity. This measure would not require SFPP to install MOVs at these locations. The text of this measure has been revised in the Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure to Impact G-3 on page D.7-18) to include review by the California State Fire Marshal, as was shown in Table F-6 of the Draft EIR.

The Final EIR includes a revision to Table F-6 (see Section 4, changes to page F-9 and F-10) to achieve consistency with Section D.7 of the Draft EIR, which does not mention a landslide at MP 9.7.

Mitigation Measure G-3b (Valves at Landslide Crossings) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact G-3 on page D.7-19) to clarify that CSLC approval of final valve locations, in conjunction with the California State Fire Marshal, would be necessary. In the interest of environmental and public safety, CSLC believes that placing MOVs and/or check valves at either side of the mapped landslide could help to arrest product flow in the event of a seismically triggered landslide. In some cases "burying the pipeline beneath the slide plane" may reduce this impact, but geologic conditions can change and unanticipated events could trigger larger, deeper slides that could severely damage the pipeline. Not all landslides can be successfully stabilized in all conditions. CSLC believes that the valves required by Mitigation Measure G-3b would minimize the impact of free-flowing petroleum products released by a rupture caused in the event of an unusual, but not unprecedented, landslide occurrence.

37-45 The text of Mitigation Measure G-4a (Construction Below Active Highways and Railroads) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact G-4 on page D.7-19) to clarify that approval of railroad crossings would be the responsibility of the appropriate facility owner.

37-46 The text of Mitigation Measure G-5a (General Fault Crossing Design Parameters) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact G-5 on page D.7-21) to update the information regarding fault crossings according to the recent finite element analysis submitted by SFPP. The final types, number, and locations of valves may vary depending on the final assessment by CLSC staff.

37-47 The comments to allow flexibility in the Pipeline Operations and Maintenance Plan (POMP) have not been included with Mitigation Measure G-5b (Pipeline Operations Plan) in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under Mitigation Measure for Impact G-5 page 4-71) because the CSLC believes that specifying the contents of the POMP is necessary to ensure that a complete plan will be submitted. The recommendations from SFPP to involve the California State Fire Marshal have been incorporated into the text of the measure.

37-48 The text of Mitigation Measure G-6a (Excavation Safety and Trench Design) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under Mitigation Measure for Impact G-6 on page D.7-23) to clarify that the measure addresses the effect of strong groundshaking on above-ground structures as well as on open trenches during construction. Only the Concord Station has above-ground structures relatively close to a seismic source; this is why it is the only location mentioned. Though trenches will only be open temporarily during construction, standard OSHA-approved shoring for trenches may not be sufficient to protect workers in the unlikely, but not inconceivable event, of an earthquake during construction.

37-49 The text of Mitigation Measure G-7a (Reduce Liquefaction Hazard) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under Mitigation Measure for Impact G-7 on page D.7-24) to clarify and update the requirements of the final geotechnical analysis for liquefaction hazards. The erroneous reference to Table D.7-4 in the Draft EIR has been removed because this information is included in Table F-6, Mitigation Monitoring Program, in the Draft EIR (Section F, page F-10) and Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Table F-6).

37-50 The text of Mitigation Measure G-8a (Protection from Seiche Inundation) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact G-8 on page D.7-25) to clarify that no subsurface investigation is needed for providing protection from seiche inundation.

37-51 The text of Mitigation Measure HS-1d (Pacheco Slough Crossing) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact HS-1 on page D.8-14) to clarify that only flowing water would preclude open-cut construction at Pacheco Slough.

37-52 The text of Mitigation Measure HS-3a (Response to Unanticipated Release of Drilling Fluids) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact HS-3 on page D.8-15) to clarify the requirements for depths of water crossings and requirements for fluorescent dye.

37-53 In Draft EIR Section D.8.3.4, Mitigation Measure GW-4a (Install Thicker Wall Pipeline or Weight Coating in Strategic Areas) has been revised (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact GW-4 on page D.8-24) to eliminate reference to nearby municipal wells, since it is agreed that Mitigation Measure GW-4b (Water Well Protection) and other measures will be effective. Mitigation Measure GW-4a has also revised to more specifically address the buoyancy concern (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact GW-4 on page D.8-24).

37-54 The text of Mitigation Measure GW-4b (Water Well Protection) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact GW-4 on page D.8-24).

37-55 The text of Mitigation Measure LU-1a (Construction Notification) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact LU-1 on page D.9-18).

37-56 The text of Mitigation Measure LU-2b (Compensation to Land Owners) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact LU-2 on page D.9-19) to reflect standard right-of-way practice.

37-57 The text of Mitigation Measure T-6a (Restoration of Roads) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact T-6 on page D.12-14).

37-58 The text of Mitigation Measure T-7a (Coordinate with Public Transit) has been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Mitigation Measure for Impact T-7 on page D.12-15) to delete the "60 days" reference.

37-59 As shown in Table D.14-4, Data Matrix for Analysis of Relative Impacts on Minority and Low-Income Populations (Draft EIR, Section D.14, Environmental Justice, page D.14-5), the project area contains areas of low-income and minority populations. Therefore, mitigation proposed in Mitigation Measure EJ-2a (Spill Containment and Response, page D.14-16 of the Draft EIR) is required (based on the significance criteria outlined in Section D.14.2.1 on page D.14-8) to minimize any potential impacts to these low-income and minority populations related to the spacing of spill containment and response equipment along the pipeline corridor to a less than significant level. Please see Response to Comment 37-13 regarding the relevance of spill response equipment and locations near the Sacramento Delta.

37-60 Comment noted. The Mitigation Monitoring tables of Chapter F have been revised in this Final EIR (see Section 4, under changes to Table F-1 beginning on page F-3).